

Interoffice Memorandum  
930-04-014  
August 20, 2004

To: Gene Burke

From: David Morris

Subject: Resource Allocation Review Board (RARB) Survey Results

On August 10, 2004, the Resource Allocation Review Board met and discussed the years 2005-2007. NASA HQ, DSMS Management and the flight projects Kepler and Dawn gave presentations. A survey was given to the attendees. The last time a survey was taken was in 2000. This memo is an analysis of the collected surveys.

Attendance and Survey Demographics:

87 signed the attendance sheet at the RARB. Every flight project and DSN user was represented at the meeting. 37% of those attending (less IND/DSMS and RAPSO Staff) responded to the survey.

The demographics of those returning surveys are:

<b>Project*</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Non-Project</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Non-JPL</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>JPL (or JPL Contractor)</b>	<b>62%</b>

\* - Where Project is defined as a member of the Mission Set

It is interesting to note that 38% of the surveys contained additional comments. These will be interspersed with the individual questions' results as applicable.

Survey Results:

Question A: This question concerned itself with the format of the RARB. Whether presentations by HQ, DSMS Management and Flight Projects were useful in focusing discussion on issues of the Deep Space Network was agreed to by 95% of the respondents. It was nearly split between whether they were strongly agreed or just agreed with the question. Comments that were received that are applicable were:

- RARB is a funnel of useful information and it is helpful to be kept abreast of DSN Support Services, organizational changes, & future system plans, which affect/could affect Project interface requirements.
- A secondary objective to the RARB is the dissemination of high level DSMS organization, missions, & equipment status. This information is very helpful to missions that are not at JPL.
- The RARB still serves as a single point of information for me on the DSN. I like it that way. I always know when I will be here and get an update on where we are with the DSN. This should continue.

Question B: This question concerned itself with the focus of the Contention Analysis portion of the meeting. Now, only contentions involving high priority events will be discussed if it is unresolved prior to the meeting. In effect, this pushes smaller allocation issues to the JURAP (Joint Users Resource Allocation Planning) Meeting and allows these contentions to be addressed at the proper planning epoch (six to nine months from present). This will refocus JURAP to become an *Allocation Planning* forum. 90% of the respondents agreed to this change. It is noteworthy that 76% of the respondents strongly agreed with this. Comments that were received that are applicable were:

- RARB serves as a useful forcing function to solve problems before the meeting and that's a good thing.
- Will require more time on the Program's part, but I agree with the need for this (i.e., moving detailed, specific discussions to a more reasonable planning epoch).
- Continue open presentation and discussion of future critical events on missions as it affects the DSN. The use of this forum for "late" updates (covering the next year or two), to mission plans allows optimal return from each project.
- The RARB & long term scheduling process is run very effectively and materials provided are very useful.

#### 2000 Survey Results Comparison:

In 2000, while the questions were different there were some similarities in question content. 70% agreed with the format of the RARB. One of the comments suggested that the... "use of monthly JURAP meeting for special project issues may be more timely than waiting for the RARB." While this and other process changes were made after that survey, those planned now are more specific. Demographics of the respondents were very similar to the current survey; 85% were from Projects and 30% were non-JPL.

#### Proposed Process Change:

Because of these results, RAPSO will institute the following changes:

- 1) JURAP meetings (the next is in September) will be modified to:
  - a) Address mid-term issues as they arise 6-9 months ahead.
  - b) Agenda will shift East coast missions to better time slot allowing for their staff to attend. (The day of week and time may change if warranted)
  - c) Specific issues in September that may be addressed are Genesis backup scheduling if needed, Space Geodesy passes and Reference Frame Calibration pass placement (these are 24 hour passes that can significantly affect spacecraft support)
- 2) RARB contention package will be a slimmer book that will:
  - a) Not address these 24-hour calibration and radio astronomy issues unless it is warranted.
  - b) To facilitate even greater communication, the Resource Analysis Team will provide projects clearer definition of the impacts (before/after) of recommended adjustments to their requested support.